



F U N D A Ç Ã O
GETULIO VARGAS

EPGE

Escola de Pós-Graduação
em Economia

Ensaio Econômico

Escola de

Pós Graduação

em Economia

da Fundação

Getúlio Vargas

Nº 588

ISSN 0104-8910

Purchasing Power Parity: The Choice of Price Index

Maria Cristina Terra, Ana Lucia Vahia de Abreu

Abril de 2005

**Os artigos publicados são de inteira responsabilidade de seus autores. As opiniões
neles emitidas não exprimem, necessariamente, o ponto de vista da Fundação
Getulio Vargas.**

Purchasing Power Parity: The Choice of Price Index*

Maria Cristina T. Terra
EPGE/FGV

Ana Lucia Vahia de Abreu
EPGE/FGV

Abstract

Looking closely at the PPP argument, it states that the currencies purchasing power should not change when comparing the same basket goods across countries, and these goods should all be tradable. Hence, if PPP is valid at all, it should be captured by the relative price indices that best fits these two features. We ran a horse race among six different price indices available from the IMF database to see which one would yield higher PPP evidence, and, therefore, better fit the two features. We used RER proxies measured as the ratio of export unit values, wholesale prices, value added deflators, unit labor costs, normalized unit labor costs and consumer prices, for a sample of 16 industrial countries, with quarterly data from 1975 to 2002. PPP was tested using both the ADF and the DF-GLS unit root test of the RER series. The RER measured as WPI ratios was the one for which PPP evidence was found for the larger number of countries: six out of sixteen when we use DF-GLS test with demeaned series. The worst measure of all was the RER based on the ratio of foreign CPIs and domestic WPI. No evidence of PPP at all was found for this measure.

Keywords: real exchange rate, price indices, purchasing power parity
JEL Classification Number: F31, F41

1 Introduction

The purchasing power parity (PPP) hypothesis, in its original formulation, states that the price levels of two countries should be equal, when measured by the same currency. This is an old idea in economics, but the term was coined only in 1918 by Gustav Cassel. As Cassel (1918) puts it, “(a)s long as anything

*We thank, without implicating, Luiz Renato Regis de Oliveira Lima, Renato Flôres and seminar participants at LAMES, Santiago, for useful comments. The first author gratefully acknowledges financial support from CNPq.

like free movement of merchandise and a somewhat comprehensive trade between the two countries takes place, the actual rate of exchange cannot deviate very much from this purchasing power parity.”

Although ever since some variant of PPP has been the building block for modeling exchange rates long-run behavior, empirical evidence on its validity is, at best, controversial. PPP does not seem to hold in the short run at all, which fits economists assessment that PPP should not hold continuously. However, empirical evidence on long run validity of PPP is also scant. The empirical literature on the subject has investigated possible reasons for the failure of finding hard evidence on long run PPP. Part of the literature credits this failure to the combination of slow speed of convergence, high short run volatility, and not long enough periods of time for testing the long run behavior of the series, for the studies concentrate on post-Bretton-Woods data. The idea is that, with a long enough time span, data on prices and exchange rates would deliver PPP. (See Froot and Rogoff, 1995, and Rogoff, 1996.)

Several studies using long span data sets do find more consistent evidence of long-run PPP (see Sarno and Taylor, 2002, for a brief review of this literature). The problem with covering a long time frame is that they encompass several different exchange rate regimes. It would be desirable to limit the sample to the pos-Bretton-Woods period. Long time periods are also more prone to include periods with real shock that shift the equilibrium real exchange rate (RER).

Another strand of the literature tries to circumvent the short period of time after Bretton Woods by using panel data. Several such studies reject random walk for the panel. These results, however, solely indicates that random walk is rejected for at least one of the RERs used. They do not provide evidence of PPP holding for all of them. Sarno and Taylor (2002) also discuss the results of this literature.

The literature has also turned to nonlinear models to try and explain real ex-

change rate dynamics. The idea is that transaction costs would yield deviations from PPP, which, in turn, would follow a mean reverting nonlinear process. This would also explain PPP deviations for long periods of time. Sarno and Taylor (2002) present a thorough discussion of this evolving line of research.

An old concern about PPP testing, dating back to Keynes (1932), is the very choice of the price indices to be used. The ideal index should measure the exact same basket of goods in all countries, and these goods should all be tradable. Such an index does not exist, though. The most commonly indices used for testing PPP are Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Wholesale Price Index (WPI). A positive feature of these indices is that they are readily available for most countries and for long time frames. On the negative side, these indices include nontradable goods and they do not measure a common basket of goods across countries. The CPI includes a larger share of nontradable goods than the WPI, hence, one could argue, the WPI would better suit the PPP concept.

This paper revisits this original debate over the price index choice, which should be of an index with the most share of tradable goods and without much variation on the composition of its goods basket across countries. Using PPP testing as a device for spotting those two features, we perform a horse race among six different price indices available from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We would expect that, if PPP is valid at all, it would be captured when measuring prices by the price index most in line with those two features. We perform unit root tests for multilateral real exchange rate measures for 16 industrialized countries, for the period from 1975 to 2002. The price indices used are export unit values, wholesale prices, value added deflators, unit labor costs, normalized unit labor costs and consumer prices.

There are studies that test the PPP hypothesis for different price indices such as Dornbush (1987) that uses CPI, GDP deflator, the GDP deflator for manufacturing and export prices of non-electrical machinery. He finds no evi-

dence of PPP for all price indices studied. Chinn (1998) also implements the PPP testing for different price indices, for several Asian economies. He uses CPI, WPI, PPI and export unit value index. The PPI based results indicate some support for the PPP hypothesis.

Regarding the estimation method, the very early empirical literature tested PPP by estimating simple ordinary least square regressions of price indices on exchange rates. With the evolution of time series econometric modeling, unit root tests based either on augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) or variance ratio tests became popular in this literature, along with cointegration studies. Economists have identified the low power of those tests as one possible explanation for the failure to reject random walk from RER series. Sarno and Taylor (2002) perform a Monte Carlo experiment where they simulate data based on a AR(1) model for the RER using different values for the autoregressive coefficient, as estimated in the literature. Using the simulated data, they find that “the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis of a random walk real exchange rate, when, in fact, the real rate is mean reverting, would only be somewhere between about 5 and 7.5 percent.” To mitigate this problem, we follow Taylor (2002) and use the Dickey-Fuller test using generalized least squares (DF-GLS) developed by Elliot and al. (1996). This test is a modification of ADF test that increases its power without otherwise altering the method of testing.

Our main results are the following. First, the RER constructed with WPIs supports the PPP hypothesis for the larger number of countries. Hence, this index seems to be the one that best represents tradable goods with similar basket of goods for all countries. Second, when using export unit values, the PPP is verified for only 4 countries. This index includes only goods that are actually traded by the country, hence its goods baskets composition most probably differs across countries to a greater extent, compared to the other indices. Third, deterministic trends were found to be significant, possibly indicating

some Balassa-Samuelson effect. Fourth, for the RER measured as the ratio of foreign CPI and domestic WPI, we find no evidence of PPP holding. This is consistent with the idea that CPI has a large share of nontradable goods which are not arbitrated across countries.

The paper is organized as follows. Section two presents the purchasing power parity argument, and its relation to the price indices used to calculate relative purchasing power. The methodology used in the empirical exercises is presented in section three. Section four presents the data and section five the empirical results. Finally, section 6 concludes.

2 Purchasing Power Parity

Absolute PPP states that, abstracting from any trade frictions, price levels in two economies should be equal, when measured in the same currency, that is:

$$\frac{EP^*}{P} = 1, \quad (1)$$

where E is the exchange rate, and P and P^* are the price indices in home and foreign countries, respectively. In reality, impediments to trade, such as transport costs and trade barriers, prevent prices to be perfectly equalized. Trade restrictions do not preclude prices from being arbitrated, though, so that prices in different countries should be closely related. Relative PPP allows for obstacles to trade that drive a wedge between the purchasing power of currencies. It states that exchange rate change should reflect relative price changes:

$$\widehat{E} = \widehat{P} - \widehat{P}^*, \quad (2)$$

where $\widehat{X} = \frac{d \log X}{X}$. Relative PPP should hold when the difference in prices driven by trade frictions do not change over time.

Going from absolute PPP to relative PPP is not only a way of getting around the qualifications arising from trade frictions. It is also a way to solve the

problem of prices that are only reported as indices, as opposed to an actual price of a basket of goods. As the price indices are normalized in a base year, even if absolute PPP held, equation (1) would not hold.

PPP, in both its absolute or relative versions, depicts a relation between tradable goods, for these are the goods that are arbitrated by international trade. Hence, the price indices used for testing either equation (1) or equation (2) should contain only tradable goods. Moreover, the price indices to be compared should be composed of the same basket of goods. Unfortunately, no price index has these two features. Price indices available always contain both tradable and nontradable goods, and its goods composition varies, not only across countries, but also over time.

To illustrate the effect on PPP testing of the presence of nontradable goods in the price index and of differences in the price indices composition, let us represent domestic and foreign price indices by a weighted average of tradable and nontradable goods:

$$P = P_N^\alpha P_T^{1-\alpha}, \text{ and}$$

$$P^* = P_N^{*\beta} P_T^{*(1-\beta)},$$

where P_N and P_T represent nontradable and tradable goods, respectively, and α and β are the share of nontradable goods in domestic and foreign price indices, respectively. The currency purchasing power for these two price indices, that is, the real exchange rate (RER), equals:

$$\frac{EP^*}{P} = \left(\frac{EP_T^*}{P_T} \right) \left(\frac{P_T^*}{P_N^*} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{P_T}{P_N} \right)^{-\alpha},$$

or, in percent changes:

$$\widehat{E} + \widehat{P^*} - \widehat{P} = \left(\widehat{E} + \widehat{P_T^*} - \widehat{P_T} \right) - \beta \left(\widehat{P_T^*} - \widehat{P_N^*} \right) + \alpha \left(\widehat{P_T} - \widehat{P_N} \right). \quad (3)$$

International trade arbitrages prices of tradable goods only, so that just the first term in equation (3) should equal zero. PPP failure in empirical test-

ing could be caused by the presence of nontradable goods in the price index. The higher the share of nontradable goods, given by parameters α and β , the higher the impact of nontradable goods relative prices on the currency relative purchasing power.

In addition to the presence of nontradable in the price index, they are also measured differently across countries. This is already partially captured by the difference in parameters α and β . However, the tradable goods composites P_T^* and P_T may also be comprised of different goods basket. Let these indices contain two goods: an exportable and an importable good, with prices P_X and P_M , respectively. The tradables indices in each country may, then, be represented by:

$$P_T = P_X^a P_M^{1-a}, \text{ and}$$

$$P_T^* = P_X^{*b} P_M^{*(1-b)},$$

where a and b are the weights of exportables in each index. Substituting these definitions in equation (3), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E} + \widehat{P^*} - \widehat{P} = & b \left(\widehat{E} + \widehat{P_X^*} - \widehat{P_X} \right) + (1-b) \left(\widehat{E} + \widehat{P_M^*} - \widehat{P_M} \right) + \quad (4) \\ & + (b-a) \left(\widehat{P_X} - \widehat{P_M} \right) + \\ & + \beta \left(\widehat{P_N^*} - \widehat{P_T^*} \right) - \alpha \left(\widehat{P_N} - \widehat{P_T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, only the first line in equation (4) would be equal to zero by international price arbitrage. The second line represents changes in measured currency purchasing power due to differences in indices composition. When the indices have the same basket composition we have that $a = b$, and the second line equals zero. The third line captures the effect of the presence of nontradable goods, as discussed above.

Forty years ago Balassa (1964) and Samuelson (1964) set forth the first and most influential model for PPP deviations. They observed that nontradable

good price tend to be higher relative to prices of tradable goods in high-income countries compared to low-income countries. Balassa and Samuelson explained this empirical regularity by conjecturing that this relative price differential reflected the fact that richer economies have higher relative productivity in the tradable goods sector. Given the competitive labor market within each country, the workers with the same skill should receive the same wage in tradable and nontradable goods sector. Then, the relatively speedy productivity growth in the tradable goods sector implies to increase the relative cost of production in the nontradable sector and, consequently, the relative price of nontradable goods. If international price arbitrage equalizes relative price of tradable goods across countries, such an increase in the relative price of nontradables would give rise to an increase in the currency purchasing power for the higher income country, that is a RER appreciation. (See, for instance, Rogoff, 1996, and Ito et al., 1996). In terms of equation (4), taking $\alpha = \beta$ to simplify the argument, the Balassa-Samuelson effect states that, in average, the third line of the equation should be negative when home country is richer than the foreign country.

There is a large literature studying the effect of real variables on deviations of PPP. The RER is modeled as a function of several real variables, such as international terms of trade, trade policy, capital and aid flows, technology and productivity (see, for instance, Baumol and Bowen, 1996, Froot and Rogoff, 1995, De Gregorio, Giovannini and Wolf, 1994, Elbadawi, 1994, and Edwards, 1989, 1994).

3 Methodology

According to Rogoff (1996), the empirical literature on PPP has arrived at a consensus on two facts. First, the purchasing power parity is valid in the long run with very slow speed of convergence to PPP. In fact, Froot and Rogoff (1995)

observe that the convergence to PPP is so slow that it makes it difficult to differentiate between a random walk and a stationary RER that converge very slowly towards equilibrium. Second, the deviations from PPP in the short-run are very large and volatile.

Until the late 1970s, the empirical literature on PPP testing focused mainly on the estimates of equation:

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta p_t + \beta^* p_t^* + \omega_t, \quad (5)$$

where s_t is the nominal exchange rate, p_t is the domestic price, p_t^* is the foreign price, all in logs, α , β and β^* are the parameters to be estimated, and ω_t is an error term. The absolute PPP test was the test of restrictions $\beta = 1$ and $\beta^* = -1$, whereas the relative PPP was tested with the same restrictions, but the variables of equation (5) in first differences (Sarno and Taylor, 2002).

The results of the early empirical literature usually indicates that the PPP hypothesis is not valid when the equation (5) is estimated. These early studies, however, do not examine if the residual series are stationary, which may lead to wrong conclusions. When the prices and the nominal exchange rate are nonstationary variables and the residuals contain a stochastic trend, then the regression is spurious. The results of regression (5), in this case, turn out to be meaningless.

Instead of estimating equation (5), the empirical literature started to analyze the nonstationarity of the RER. When the RER is nonstationary, the series present a unit root and the PPP hypothesis is rejected. Evidence against unit root behavior emerges when the RER fluctuates around a constant mean, with a tendency to return to it. In that case, the effects of shocks will dissipate and the series will revert to its long run mean level. Therefore, if RER is stationary, the PPP can be viewed as a good long run approximation for the RER behavior.

From the mid 1980s onwards, the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test has been frequently used to test RER stationarity. This test investigates whether the real exchange rate series has stochastic trend. It is based on the estimation of the following equation:

$$(1 - L) q_t = a + bt + \gamma q_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^p c_j (1 - L) q_{t-j-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (6)$$

where L is the lag operator, $q_t = \log(\text{RER}_t)$, a is the intercept or drift, b is the linear time trend, p is the number of lags of the RER used in the estimation, and ε_t is the residual. The ADF statistic is the t-statistic for the γ coefficient.

The null hypothesis of the test is $\gamma = 0$ and the alternative hypothesis is $\gamma < 0$. If the test does not reject the null hypothesis, it implies that the RER series presents a unit root. The problem with the ADF test is that it has low power to discriminate between $\gamma = 0$ and a negative value for γ , but very close to zero. For the analysis of PPP, this low power is a problem because, empirically, when the mean reversion occurs ($\gamma < 0$), it does so at a very slow speed of convergence, that is, the value of γ is very near zero.

The generalized-least-square (GLS) version of the Dickey Fuller (DF) test suggested by Elliot et al. (1996) has more power than the ADF, without altering the method of testing. The DF-GLS test may be described as follows. First, the means and/or linear trends are removed from the series. The demeaned time series are the residuals from a regression of the RER on a constant, whereas the detrended series are the residuals from a regression of the RER on a constant and a linear trend. Second, the demeaned and detrended time series are replaced in the ADF regression as follows:

$$\Delta q_t^d = \gamma q_{t-1}^d + \sum_{j=1}^p c_j \Delta q_{t-j-1}^d + \varepsilon_t. \quad (7)$$

where q_t^d is the demeaned or detrended series. Third, like the ADF test, the

t-ratio for $\hat{\gamma}$ is estimated and the critical values of the test statistic are simulated for demeaned and detrended series by Elliot et al. (1996).

Cheung and Lai (1998) test PPP for five industrial countries using both the ADF and the DF-GLS tests. They find that the ADF tests verifies stationarity for only two of the ten bilateral RERs studied, whereas the DF-GLS test unravels stationarity in all but two of the series. Taylor (2002) uses the DF-GLS test to investigate PPP for twenty developing and developed countries, with one hundred years of data.

In this paper, we use the DF-GLS for PPP testing for, basically, two reasons. First, it is a solution suggested by the literature for the power problem (Taylor, 2002). Elliot et al. (1996) results indicate that “the Dickey-Fuller t test applied to a locally demeaned or detrended time series, using a data-dependent lag length selection procedure, has the best overall performance in terms of small-sample size and power.” Second, it allows for deterministic trends, in the spirit of the Balassa-Samuelson effect.

4 Data

We use the following price indices from data from the IMF’s International Financial Statistics: export unit value, consumer price index (CPI), wholesale price index (WPI), unit labor cost, normalized unit labor cost and relative value added deflator. We use quarterly data for 16 industrialized countries: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and USA. The data for CPI, unit labor cost and normalized unit labor cost ranges from 1975 to 2002. WPI and value added deflator have data from 1975 to 1997, and export unit value from 1975 to 1998.

Export unit value is an indicator for export costs and prices. It is measured

as a weighted average of exported goods prices. There are two caveats about this measure. First, this index includes only tradable goods, but not all of them. It includes only goods that are actually exported, but does not compute all potentially exportable goods. It also leaves out imported or importable goods. Second, and a very important caveat that should be emphasized, the basket of goods differs across countries to a greater extent for export unit value than for the other indices. The composition of goods in this index depends on the country's export pattern. As the export pattern differs substantially across countries, so does the composition of the export unit value.

The consumer price indices has a higher share of nontradable goods than the wholesale price indices. One advantage of CPIs is that is available for a larger number of countries and with greater frequency than the other price indices. On the negative side, CPI and WPI includes several factors which may differ across countries, such as price controls, subsidies, indirect taxes and prices of imported goods. These factors may influence the results of PPP testing. Also, CPIs and WPIs are not based on the same basket of goods for different countries, for they reflect different consumption patterns.

Unit labor costs is an indicator for the labor costs, which is an important factor of production in the manufacturing sector. Unit labor costs may be calculated either directly, as total labor costs divided by the total value of output, or indirectly, as the average wage rate divided by labor productivity. This index has the following advantages. First, unit labor costs are defined similarly across industrial countries. Second, as labor costs usually represent the largest share in the total cost of production, the labor cost is a good proxy for production cost. Again, however, there is drawback. The main limitation of the relative unit labor costs as proxy for RER is that they take into account only one factor of production. To the extent that the capital/labor ratio differs across countries, this may introduce a bias into the index.

Normalized unit labor costs is an indicator for the labor costs that removes the distortions arising from cyclical changes in productivity. The advantages of this index is to remove the occasional distortions by cyclical changes in productivity. Productivity changes occur largely due to changes in hours worked that do not correspond closely to changes in the effective inputs of labor. The series on normalized unit labor costs is calculated by dividing labor costs per unit of value added adjusted so as to eliminate the estimated effect of the cyclical swings in economic activity on productivity.

Relative value added deflators is an indicator for the cost (per unit of real value added) of all factors of production in the manufacturing sector. The advantage of this index is that, differently from unit labor costs that take into account only the labor cost, it includes the cost of all factors of production. The main practical disadvantage of value added measures is the lack of cross-country comparability with regard to both concept and commodity composition. Also, they are typically available only for the manufacturing sector, and often with a substantial delay.

We use the multilateral real exchange rate to PPP testing. As stated by Edwards (1989), in a world where the main currencies are floating there are many different bilateral rates, and there is no reason why one rate should be preferred over another. For this reason, indices of RER that take into account the behavior of all the relevant bilateral exchange rate were considered.

Following the methodology of IMF, the RER was computed as:

$$RER_i = \prod_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{E_i P_i}{E_j P_j} \right]^{W_{ij}} \quad (8)$$

where the nominal exchange rate is period-average US dollars per unit of national currency and W_{ij} is the weight¹ attached by country i to country j .

¹For a discussion about the computation of weights (W_{ij}), see the appendix.

The IMF’s International Financial Statistics presents the computed RER, as in equation (8), for all indices. The only RER we computed with original price indices and nominal exchange rates from the IMF was the RER measured as the ratio of foreign countries’ WPI over domestic country’s CPI.

5 Empirical Results

We now present the results of PPP testing for the seven different proxies for RER: ratios of export unit values, WPIs, CPIs, unit labor costs, normalized unit labor costs, relative value added deflators, and the ratio between WPI and CPI. We tested PPP for each one of the indices, for each country, using both the traditional augmented Dickey-Fuller test and the power-enhancing Dickey-Fuller test using generalized least squares estimation. The ADF test was applied on the original series.

We start with PPP testing for the RER based on export unit values. The results of the ADF unit root tests are presented in the first four rows of Table 1. The unit root null hypothesis cannot be rejected in all but two countries: France and Sweden. When we allow for a trend, unit root is rejected only for Switzerland. A simple OLS regression on a constant and a trend (on the fifth row of Table 1) indicates the presence of a trend for Canada and Switzerland. Hence, the results of both detrended ADF and simple OLS indicate that, for Switzerland, the RER based on export unit values has a deterministic trend, although the trend component amounts to only 0.04% per quarter. Nonetheless, we could not reject random walk for this series in the estimation without trend, that is, in the “demeaned” result. As Taylor (2002) puts it, “it is necessary to allow for slowly-evolving deterministic trends. As an empirical matter, they are usually found to be “small”. However, their omission would undoubtedly upset any study of the deviations of real exchange rates over the very long run”.

The results for the DF-GLS test are presented in the last four rows of Table 1. Differently from the ADF test, the DF-GLS test rejects the unit root null for Sweden. Nevertheless, with the DF-GLS test there are four countries, instead of only two, for which the unit root can be rejected: France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands. The detrended Switzerland RER series also does not present a unit root, and so does the detrended France series. Comparing the two tests, the DF-GLS captures convergence in a larger number of countries compared to the ADF test, as expected. Yet, we could not reject the presence of unit roots in most of the series, in both tests.

Even though the export unit value index only includes tradable goods, the PPP hypothesis is valid for only, at most, four countries out of sixteen. The reason for this result may be that the goods basket composition differs substantially across countries. When comparing export unit values for two countries, we are comparing the weighted values for two different baskets of goods. Hence, even if the traded goods prices are arbitrated by trade, the value of the index could follow different paths in different countries due to the difference in the index composition in each of the countries.

For the RER series based on wholesale price indices, the ADF tests does not reject the unit root null for any of the series, as shown in Table 2. Using the more powerful DF-GLS, unit root is rejected for six countries: Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Spain. For the detrended estimation, unit root is not rejected for any of the countries. As we will see, this is the RER series for which PPP is valid for a larger set of countries.

Table 3 presents the results of the ADF and DF-GLS tests for the RER series constructed as CPI ratios. The presence of unit root cannot be rejected for any of the countries, using the ADF test. Using the DF-GLS test, four countries, Denmark, Finland, Italy and Norway, are found not to present unit root in their RER series. The result for Switzerland RER series is analogous to the one for its

RER series based on export unit values: we cannot reject the unit root null for its demeaned series, but, once a trend is included, the series becomes stationary. This result indicates that there is also a deterministic trend in the RER based on CPI ratios, and this is the reason for the non validity of PPP hypothesis.

The CPIs is more heavily weighted with nontradable goods than tradable goods, when compared with WPIs. As shown in equation (4), the higher the weight of nontradable goods in the price index composition, the larger may potentially be the deviations from PPP. That seems to be the case for France, Germany, Spain and Switzerland. Their RER series based on WPI were stationary, but the ones based on CPI presented unit roots. The odd cases are Denmark and Norway, for their RER series present unit roots when based on WPIs, but not when constructed using CPIs.

The results of PPP testing for RER based on unit labor cost and on normalized unit labor cost are very similar. The ADF test does not detect stationarity for any of the two series, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. Adding a trend to the estimation results in the rejection of unit root for France for the two series, and for Sweden for the unit labor cost series. The estimation with DF-GLS somewhat improves the results. Table 4 shows that the unit root null is rejected for Denmark, Italy and Sweden, for the RER based on unit labor cost. For the normalized series, unit root is rejected only for Canada and Denmark, as presented in Table 5. We cannot reject unit roots for any of the detrended estimations, for the two sets of RER series. This means that no deterministic trend explain the unit root evidence.

These results indicate that the RER proxied by the ratio of unit labor cost, normalized or not, is a poor proxy for the relative prices of tradable goods. One possible explanation is the fact the capital to labor ratio differs substantially across countries, so that the labor cost becomes a poor reflection of relative prices.

The results for the value-added-RER series are interesting. The results from ADF, in Table 6, detects no unit root. The DF-GLS, on the other hand, rejects the unit root null for five countries: France, Germany, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. These results, in Table 6, are close to the ones for the RER series based on WPI, for which stationarity was found for six countries.

The worst results are those for the RER measures as a ratio of foreign countries CPI and domestic country WPI. No evidence of stationarity of these series were found, using both the ADF and the DF-GLS unit root tests, as shown by the results presented in Table 7. This proxy for RER suffers from two of the problems that could cause PPP deviations, as detected in equation (4): some of the price indices have a large share of nontradable goods (the CPIs), and the composition of foreign and domestic indices are substantially different (as we are using simultaneously CPIs and WPIs)

Table 8 presents a summary of the results. The table presents the countries for which we found evidence of PPP for each RER proxy and unit root test used. The first striking result is that PPP is detected in a much larger set of countries when we use the DF-GLS test, compared to the ADF test. This result was expected. The DF-GLS has more power than the ADF, so that it is more competent to reject the unit root null when the speed of convergence is low.

The RER proxy leader in stationarity is the one constructed as WPIs ratios, presenting PPP evidence for six of the sixteen countries studied when we use DF-GLS test with demeaned series. This is a signal that this price index is the one that better fits the requirement for PPP: more uniform goods composition across countries and low share of nontradable goods. The second place goes to the RER based on value added. PPP evidence was found for five of the countries, for this RER proxy. The third position is a draw between the RER based on export unit values and the one based on CPIs ratio: they both yield PPP for four of the countries studied. Unquestionably, the very last place goes

to the RER constructed as the ratio between foreign countries CPIs and domestic country WPI.

Looking at the countries' perspective, France is the country for which PPP evidence was found in the larger number of RER series. There is some evidence of PPP for France for five of the seven RER proxies used. Switzerland and Italy follow closely, with PPP evidence for four of the RER series. No evidence of PPP was found in any of the series for five countries: Austria, Belgium, Japan, United Kingdom and United States.

6 Concluding Remarks

There is a huge literature testing the PPP hypothesis, most of it using either CPIs or WPIs ratios as proxies of relative currencies purchasing power, that is, of the RER. Looking closely at the PPP argument, it states that the currencies purchasing power should not change when comparing the same basket goods across countries, and these goods should all be tradable. Neither of those price indices used in PPP testing fully satisfy these two criteria: they include nontradable goods and their basket composition differs across countries. We observe that, if PPP is valid at all, it should be captured by the relative price indices that best fits these two features. Hence, we ran a horse race among six different price indices available from the IMF database to see which one would yield higher PPP evidence. We used RER proxies measured as the ratio of export unit values, wholesale prices, value added deflators, unit labor costs, normalized unit labor costs and consumer prices. PPP was tested using both the ADF and the DF-GLS unit root test of the RER series.

The RER measured as WPI ratios was the one for which PPP evidence was found for the larger number of countries: six out of sixteen when we use DF-GLS test with demeaned series. This is an indication that, from all indices used,

WPI seems to be the one with larger composition of tradable goods and with least variation in its goods basket composition across countries.

The second best RER measure was the value added deflators. On the one hand, this is an index that includes the cost of all factors of production. On the other hand, the index composition may vary substantially across countries due to the lack of cross-country comparability.

Unit labor costs and normalized unit labor cost proved to be poor measures of tradable goods, as PPP evidence was found for a small number of countries, when RER was measured by them. However, the worst measure of all was the RER based on the ratio of foreign CPI and domestic WPI. No evidence of PPP at all was found for this measure.

Finally, deterministic trends were found to be significant in several cases, possibly indicating some Balassa-Samuelson effect.

Overall, this paper also identifies the importance of the price index choice to compute the RER for PPP testing. The results differs substantially when different proxies for the RER were used. Nevertheless, some consistency was present. We found evidence for RER series for France, Switzerland and Italy for most of the RER proxies, whereas no PPP evidence was found for Austria, Belgium, Japan, United kingdom and United States for any of the proxies.

References

- [1] Balassa, Bela, 1964, “The Purchasing Power Parity Doctrine: A Reappraisal,” *Journal of Political Economy* 72: 584-96.
- [2] Cassel, Gustav, 1918, “Abnormal Deviations in International Exchanges,” *The Economic Journal* 28 (112): 413-415.

- [3] Cheung, Yin-Wong and Kon S. Lai, 1998, "Parity Reversion in Real Exchange Rates during the Post-Bretton Woods Period," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 17(4): 597-614.
- [4] Chinn, Menzie, 1998, "Before the Fall: Were East Asian Currencies Overvalued", *Emerging Markets Review* 1 (2).
- [5] De Gregorio, José, Alberto Giovannini and Holger C. Wolf, 1994, "International Evidence on Tradables and Nontradables Inflation," *European Economic Review* 38(June).
- [6] Dornbusch, Rudiger, 1987, "Purchasing Power Parity," in John Eatwell, Murray Milgate and Peter Newman (eds.) *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, vol. 3: 1075-85 (New York: Stockton Press, 3rd ed.).
- [7] Edwards, Sebastian, 1989, *Real Exchange Rates, Devaluation and Adjustment: Exchange Rate Policy in Developing Countries* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press).
- [8] Edwards, Sebastian, 1994, "Real and Monetary Determinants of Real Exchange Rate Behavior: Theory and Evidence from Developing Countries," in John Williamson (ed.) *Estimating Equilibrium Exchange Rates* (Washington: Institute for International Economics).
- [9] Elbadawi, Ibrahim, 1994, "Estimating Long-Run Equilibrium Real Exchange Rates," in John Williamson (ed.) *Estimating Equilibrium Exchange Rates* (Washington: Institute for International Economics).
- [10] Elliott, Graham, Thomas J. Rothenberg and James H. Stock, 1996, "Efficient Tests for an Autoregressive Unit Root," *Econometrica* 64(4): 813-36.
- [11] Frenkel, Jacob A., 1978, "Purchasing Power Parity: Doctrinal Perspective and evidence from 1920s", *Journal of International Economics* 8: 169-91.

- [12] Froot, Kenneth A. and Kenneth Rogoff, 1995, "Perspectives on PPP and Long Run Real Exchange Rates," in Gene M. Grossman and Kenneth Rogoff (eds.) *Handbook of International Economics*, vol. 3 (Amsterdam: North-Holland).
- [13] International Monetary Fund, 1984, "Issues in the Assessment of the Exchange Rates of Industrial Countries", IMF Occasional Paper No. 29.
- [14] Ito, Takatoshi, Peter Isard, Steven Symansky and Tamim Bayoumi, 1996, "Exchange Rate Movements and Their Impact in Trade and Investment in the APEC Region", IMF Occasional Paper No. 145.
- [15] Keynes, John M., 1932, *Essays in Persuasion* (New York: Hartcourt Brace).
- [16] Rogoff, Kenneth, 1996, "The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle," *Journal of Economic Literature* 34: 647-68.
- [17] Samuelson, Paul A., 1964, "Theoretical Notes on Trade Problems", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 46: 145-54.
- [18] Sarno, Lucio and Taylor, Mark P., 2002, "Purchasing Power Parity and the Real Exchange Rate", IMF Staff Papers vol. 49, No 1 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- [19] Taylor, Alan N., 2002, "A Century of Purchasing-Power Parity," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(1): 139-50.

7 Appendix

This appendix presents the methodologies for computation of weights (W_{ij}) that is published in the Fund's International Financial Statistics.

We begin with the methodology for the weights used in the computation of RER based on relative export unit values, wholesale prices, value added deflators, unit labor costs and normalized unit labor costs.

From January 1991 onwards, W_{ij} uses data on trade and consumption of manufactured goods over the period 1989-91. Before that, the weights used in the computation of MRER were based on 1980 data.

Let there be k markets in which the producers of country i and country j compete. Let T_l^k represent the sales of country l in market k . Let s_j^k be country j 's market share in market k and w_i^k be the share of country i 's output sold in market k , which is to say:

$$s_j^k = \frac{T_j^k}{\sum_l T_l^k} \text{ and} \quad (9)$$

$$w_i^k = \frac{T_i^k}{\sum_n T_i^n}. \quad (10)$$

Then, the weight attached to country j by country i is:

$$W_{ij} = \frac{\sum_k w_i^k s_j^k}{\sum_k w_i^k (1 - s_i^k)}. \quad (11)$$

This weight can be interpreted as the sum over all markets of a gauge of the degree of competition between producers of countries i and j divided by the sum over all markets of a gauge of the degree of competition between producers of country i and all other producers.

The world is divided into 22 markets, the first 21 markets being the countries² for which MRER were being computed by IMF and the last market is

²These 21 countries are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

called "Rest-of-the-World".

Next we will present the second methodology that describes the weights used in the computation of MRER based on consumer price index.

From January 1990 onwards, W_{ij} is weighted by a set of weights based on trade in manufactures, non-oil primary commodities and, for a set of 46 countries and regions³ in which services accounted to meet more than 20 percent of all exports in 1989-90, tourism services covering the three-year period 1988-1990. Prior to January 1990, the weights are for the three-year span 1980-82.

These weights are then aggregated to derive the overall weight attached by country i to country j , W_{ij} . Specifically:

$$W_{ij} = \alpha_i(M)W_{ij}(M) + \alpha_i(P)W_{ij}(P) + \alpha_i(T)W_{ij}(T), \quad (12)$$

where $W_{ij}(M)$, $W_{ij}(P)$ and $W_{ij}(T)$ are weights based on trade in manufactures, primary commodities and tourism services. The factors $\alpha_i(M)$, $\alpha_i(P)$ and $\alpha_i(T)$ are the shares of trade in manufactures, primary commodities and tourism services in country i 's external trade, with external computed as the sum of trade in manufactures, primary commodities and tourism services. Observe that $\alpha_i(T) = 0$ for a set of countries in which services accounted to meet less than 20 percent of all exports in 1989-90. For these countries, $\alpha_i(M)$ and $\alpha_i(P)$ are the shares of trade in manufactures and primary commodities in total trade, with total trade being computed as the sum of trade in these two categories.

The weights based on trade in manufactures, $W_{ij}(M)$, and on trade in tourism, $W_{ij}(T)$, are computed in a manner analogous to equation (11). These

³These 46 countries and regions are Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands Antilles, Portugal, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Vanuatu, Western Samoa and Republic of Yemen.

weights are a weighted sum of a weight reflecting competition in the domestic market, a weight reflecting competition abroad against domestic producers and a weight reflecting competition abroad against exporters.

The weights based on trade in primary commodities, $W_{ij}(P)$, are computed in a very different way. Contrary to manufactured goods and tourism services, primary commodities are assumed to be homogeneous goods. Then, for each commodity, the weight attached to country j by any country should reflect the importance of country j as either a seller or a buyer in the world market. Therefore, for country i , the weight attached to country j , $W_{ij}(P)$, should be a (normalized) sum over all commodity markets of the product of the individual weight of country j in each market h times the importance of market h for country i .

Table 1: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on export unit value

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-2,12	4	-2,11	4	0,0000	-0,34	4	-1,44	4	
Belgium	-2,55	0	-2,20	0	0,0000	-0,94	0	-1,58	0	
Canada	-0,31	0	-2,40	0	-0,0002 **	1,53	0	-2,46	0	
Denmark	-1,20	0	-1,52	0	0,0000	-1,22	0	-1,32	0	
Finland	-2,19	0	-2,14	0	0,0000	-0,68	0	-1,74	0	
France	-2,61 *	0	-2,90	0	0,0000	-2,60 ***	0	-2,87 *	0	
Germany	-1,77	0	-1,93	0	0,0000	-1,75 *	0	-2,02	0	
Italy	-2,41	0	-2,43	0	0,0000	-2,36 **	0	-2,46	0	
Japan	-1,21	0	-1,74	0	0,0001	-1,21	0	-1,48	0	
Netherlands	-2,42	0	-2,54	0	0,0000	-2,04 **	0	-2,23	0	
Norway	-2,49	1	-2,79	1	-0,0001	-0,94	1	-2,43	1	
Spain	-1,30	0	-2,15	0	0,0001 *	-1,25	0	-1,79	0	
Sweden	-2,69	0	-2,43	0	0,0000	-1,06	0	-1,76	0	
Switzerland	-1,06	0	-3,40 *	0	0,0004 ***	-0,12	0	-3,32 **	0	
UK	-2,13	0	-2,64	0	0,0001	-0,81	0	-2,48	0	
US	-1,51	0	-1,50	0	0,0000	-0,69	0	-1,19	0	

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 1998:2. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels. The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,89, -3,51) for the demeaned series and (-3,16, -3,46, -4,06) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,77, -3,07, -3,62) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 2: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on wholesale price index

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-1,58	2	-2,63	2	-0,0001 **	-1,51	2	-2,37	2	
Belgium	-1,38	1	-1,10	0	0,0000	-0,02	1	-1,08	0	
Canada	-1,88	0	-1,77	0	0,0000	-1,04	0	-1,56	0	
Denmark	-1,51	0	-1,83	0	0,0000	-1,52	0	-1,65	0	
Finland	-1,30	0	-1,46	0	0,0000	-1,71 *	1	-1,50	0	
France	-1,83	0	-1,92	0	0,0000	-1,74 *	0	-1,80	0	
Germany	-1,69	0	-2,08	0	0,0000	-1,69 *	0	-1,86	0	
Italy	-1,90	0	-1,92	0	0,0000	-1,89 *	0	-1,95	0	
Japan	-1,57	0	-1,71	0	0,0001	-1,59	1	-1,86	0	
Netherlands	-1,39	0	-1,54	0	0,0000	-1,39	0	-1,45	0	
Norway	-1,51	0	-0,58	0	0,0000	-0,52	0	-0,92	0	
Spain	-2,21	0	-2,16	0	0,0000	-2,21 **	0	-2,22	0	
Sweden	-2,30	0	-2,23	0	0,0000	-1,52	0	-2,03	0	
Switzerland	-2,47	0	-2,70	0	0,0001	-2,49 **	0	-2,65	0	
UK	-1,77	0	-2,22	0	0,0001	-0,50	0	-2,09	0	
US	-1,12	0	-1,57	0	-0,0001	-1,22	0	-1,40	0	

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 1997:1. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels. The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,90, -3,51) for the demeaned series and (-3,16, -3,46, -4,07) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,78, -3,07, -3,63) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 3: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on consumer price index

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-1,52	0	-1,59	0	0,0000	-0,74	0	-1,66	0	
Belgium	-1,63	1	-1,76	1	0,0000	-0,90	1	-1,75	1	
Canada	-1,13	1	-1,58	0	-0,0001	-0,20	1	-1,59	0	
Denmark	-1,85	0	-2,13	0	0,0000	-1,81 *	0	-1,90	0	
Finland	-1,64	1	-1,55	0	0,0000	-1,64 *	1	-1,37	0	
France	-1,63	0	-2,26	0	0,0000	-0,61	0	-2,25	0	
Germany	-2,00	0	-1,94	0	0,0000	-0,81	1	-1,54	0	
Italy	-2,00	1	-1,47	0	0,0000	-1,98 **	1	-2,07	1	
Japan	-2,08	1	-1,79	0	0,0001	-0,71	1	-1,72	0	
Netherlands	-1,76	0	-1,73	0	0,0000	-1,16	0	-1,82	0	
Norway	-1,97	0	-1,65	0	0,0000	-1,64 *	0	-1,93	0	
Spain	-1,84	0	-1,73	0	0,0000	-1,22	0	-1,62	0	
Sweden	-1,10	0	-2,12	0	-0,0001 *	0,01	0	-2,16	0	
Switzerland	-2,12	0	-2,89	0	0,0001 *	-1,45	0	-2,91 *	0	
UK	-1,69	0	-1,95	0	0,0001	-1,09	0	-1,97	0	
US	-1,04	0	-1,08	0	0,0000	-0,92	0	-1,16	0	

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 2002:3. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels. The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,89, -3,49) for the demeaned series and (-3,15, -3,45, -4,04) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,73, -3,02, -3,57) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 4: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on unit labor cost

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-0,30	1	-2,81	1	-0,0002 ***	-0,38	1	-1,26	1	
Belgium	-1,51	0	-1,09	0	0,0000	0,34	0	-0,87	0	
Canada	-1,89	0	-1,83	0	0,0000	-1,49	0	-1,60	0	
Denmark	-2,19	2	-2,29	2	0,0000	-2,21 **	2	-2,27	2	
Finland	-1,75	0	-4,48	0	-0,0004 ***	-0,85	1	-1,01	0	
France	-0,78	0	-3,29 *	0	-0,0002 ***	-0,79	0	-1,84	0	
Germany	-1,38	0	-2,12	0	0,0001 *	-1,19	0	-1,35	0	
Italy	-2,40	0	-2,35	0	0,0000	-1,74 *	0	-2,08	0	
Japan	-1,89	0	-2,29	0	0,0000	-1,48	0	-1,67	0	
Netherlands	-1,75	1	-1,29	1	0,0000	-0,32	1	-1,36	1	
Norway	0,18	0	-0,27	1	0,0000	0,56	1	-0,77	1	
Spain	-2,54	0	-2,39	0	0,0000	-0,76	0	-1,60	0	
Sweden	-1,61	0	-3,34 *	0	-0,0002 ***	-1,66 *	0	-2,31	0	
Switzerland	-0,51	2	-2,62	2	0,0002 ***	-0,74	2	-0,81	2	
UK	-1,44	0	-1,64	0	0,0000	-0,05	0	-1,51	0	
US	-1,26	0	-1,54	0	-0,0001	-1,11	0	-1,21	0	

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 2002:3. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels. The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,89, -3,49) for the demeaned series and (-3,15, -3,45, -4,04) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,73, -3,02, -3,57) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 5: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on normalized unit labor cost

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-0,55	0	-2,79	1	-0,0002 ***	-0,53	0	-1,38		1
Belgium	-2,10	0	-1,37	0	0,0000	0,71	1	-0,87		0
Canada	-2,00	1	-2,07	1	0,0000	-1,80 *	1	-1,90		1
Denmark	-2,34	0	-2,56	0	0,0000	-2,32 *	0	-2,41		0
Finland	-1,30	0	-4,09	0	-0,0004 ***	-0,83	0	-0,98		0
France	-0,38	0	-3,44 *	0	-0,0002 ***	-0,42	0	-1,55		0
Germany	-1,22	0	-2,14	0	0,0001 *	-1,14	0	-1,32		0
Italy	-2,45	0	-2,39	0	0,0000	-1,56	0	-1,96		0
Japan	-1,91	0	-2,39	0	0,0001	-1,50	0	-1,70		0
Netherlands	-1,75	0	-1,20	0	0,0000	0,07	0	-1,21		0
Norway	-1,15	1	0,01	0	0,0001	1,30	1	-0,38		0
Spain	-2,48	0	-2,44	0	0,0000	-0,83	0	-1,91		0
Sweden	-1,15	0	-3,01	0	-0,0002 ***	-1,56	0	-2,40		0
Switzerland	-0,43	2	-2,51	2	0,0002 ***	-0,68	2	-0,88		2
UK	-1,18	0	-1,64	0	0,0000	0,07	0	-1,61		0
US	-1,25	0	-1,57	0	-0,0001	-1,02	0	-1,15		0

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 2002:3. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels.

The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,89, -3,49) for the demeaned series and (-3,15, -3,45, -4,04) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,73, -3,02, -3,57) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 6: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on value added

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-1,42	4	-2,30	3	-0,0002 **	-0,99	4	-1,90		3
Belgium	-1,73	0	-1,04	0	0,0000	-0,85	4	-0,83		0
Canada	-1,65	1	-1,69	0	0,0000	-1,46	0	-1,55		0
Denmark	-0,35	0	-1,62	0	0,0001 *	-0,27	0	-1,19		0
Finland	-0,92	0	-1,57	0	-0,0001	-0,69	0	-1,54		0
France	-2,05	0	-2,14	0	0,0000	-2,00 **	0	-2,17		0
Germany	-2,06	6	-2,02	3	0,0001	-1,84 *	6	-2,05		3
Italy	-1,82	0	-1,81	0	0,0000	-1,52	0	-1,78		0
Japan	-2,06	1	-1,65	0	0,0001	-1,20	1	-1,80		0
Netherlands	-2,09	0	-1,76	0	0,0000	-0,53	0	-1,33		0
Norway	-1,45	0	-2,28	0	0,0001	-1,57	0	-2,26		0
Spain	-2,21	0	-2,27	0	0,0001	-1,63 *	0	-2,31		0
Sweden	-2,33	0	-2,27	0	0,0000	-1,65 *	0	-2,08		0
Switzerland	-2,92	0	-2,94	0	0,0000	-2,92 ***	0	-3,00 *		0
UK	-1,75	0	-1,77	0	0,0000	-0,60	0	-1,57		0
US	-1,08	0	-1,57	0	-0,0001	-0,84	0	-1,50		0

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 1997:1. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels.

The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,59, -2,90, -3,51) for the demeaned series and (-3,16, -3,46, -4,07) for the detrended series, respectively. The DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59) for the demeaned series and (-2,79, -3,08, -3,64) for the detrended series, respectively.

Table 7: ADF and DF-GLS tests: RER based on CPI over WPI

Country	ADF test					DF GLS test				
	Demeaned		Detrended		OLS Trend	Demeaned		Detrended		
	ADF	Lags	ADF	Lags		DF-GLS	Lags	DF-GLS	Lags	
Austria	-0,01	1	-1,47	0	0,0001	0,69	2	-1,36		0
Belgium	-0,80	1	-1,59	1	0,0001 *	-0,66	1	-1,53		1
Canada	-1,49	1	-1,38	1	0,0000	-1,51	1	-1,50		1
Denmark	-1,72	0	-1,88	0	0,0000	-1,55	0	-1,64		0
Finland	-1,42	0	-1,61	0	0,0000	-0,35	0	-1,60		0
France	-0,71	0	-1,70	0	0,0001	-0,43	0	-1,57		0
Germany	-0,96	1	-1,51	0	0,0001 *	-0,91	1	-1,86		1
Italy	-1,10	1	-1,92	0	0,0002 *	-0,59	1	-1,81		0
Japan	-1,38	1	-1,81	0	0,0002	-0,16	1	-1,84		0
Netherlands	-1,00	1	-1,25	0	0,0001	-0,70	1	-1,30		0
Norway	-1,16	1	-1,33	0	0,0001	-0,87	1	-1,36		0
Spain	-1,04	1	-1,32	0	0,0001	-0,79	1	-1,34		0
Sweden	-1,12	1	-1,25	0	0,0001	-0,92	1	-1,27		0
Switzerland	-0,75	1	-1,20	0	0,0001	-0,48	1	-1,21		0
UK	-0,82	1	-1,25	0	0,0001	-0,52	1	-1,27		0
US	-0,92	0	-1,38	0	0,0001	-0,93	0	-1,41		0

Notes: Data from 1975:1 to 1998:4. The lag length is selected by Modified SIC, with maximal lag length equal to 6. Asterisks denotes significance at the *10%, **5%, and ***1% levels.

The ADF test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-2,58, -2,89, -3,50)

for the demeaned series and (-3,15, -3,46, -4,06) for the detrended series, respectively. The

DF-GLS test critical values corresponding to these significance levels are (-1,61, -1,94, -2,59)

for the demeaned series and (-2,79, -3,08, -3,64) for the detrended series, respectively.

Tabela 8: Countries with PPP evidence

RER Proxy	ADF		DF-GLS	
	Demeaned	Detrended	Demeaned	Detrended
Exp. unit v.	France Sweden	Switzerland	France Germany Italy Netherlands	France Switzerland
WPI	-	-	Finland France Germany Italy Spain Switzerland	-
CPI	-		Denmark Finland Italy Norway	Switzerland
Labor u. c.	-	France Sweden	Denmark Italy Sweden	-
Norm. l. u. v.	-	France	Canada Denmark	-
Value add.	Switzerland	-	France Germany Spain Sweden Switzerland	Switzerland
CPI/WPI	-	-	-	-

Últimos Ensaaios Econômicos da EPGE

- [594] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira, Roberto de Góes Ellery Junior, e Victor Gomes. *Produtividade Agregada Brasileira (1970–2000): declínio robusto e fraca recuperação*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 594, EPGE–FGV, Jul 2005.
- [595] Carlos Eugênio Ellery Lustosa da Costa e Lucas Jóver Maestri. *The Interaction Between Unemployment Insurance and Human Capital Policies*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 595, EPGE–FGV, Jul 2005.
- [596] Carlos Eugênio Ellery Lustosa da Costa. *Yet Another Reason to Tax Goods*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 596, EPGE–FGV, Jul 2005.
- [597] Marco Antonio Cesar Bonomo e Maria Cristina Trindade Terra. *Special Interests and Political Business Cycles*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 597, EPGE–FGV, Ago 2005.
- [598] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior. *Investimento Direto Estrangeiro no Mercosul: Uma Visão Geral*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 598, EPGE–FGV, Ago 2005.
- [599] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo e Bruno Funchal. *Past and Future of the Bankruptcy Law in Brazil and Latin America*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 599, EPGE–FGV, Ago 2005.
- [600] Marco Antonio Cesar Bonomo e Carlos Carvalho. *Imperfectly Credible Disinflation under Endogenous Time-Dependent Pricing*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 600, EPGE–FGV, Ago 2005.
- [601] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira. *Sobre a Inexistente Relação entre Política Industrial e Comércio Exterior*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 601, EPGE–FGV, Set 2005.
- [602] Luiz Renato Regis de Oliveira Lima, Raquel Sampaio, e Wagner Gaglianone. *Limite de Endividamento e Sustentabilidade Fiscal no Brasil: Uma abordagem via modelo Quantílico Auto-Regressivo (QAR)*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 602, EPGE–FGV, Out 2005.
- [603] Ricardo de Oliveira Cavalcanti e Ed Nosal. *Some Benefits of Cyclical Monetary Policy*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 603, EPGE–FGV, Out 2005.
- [604] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira e Leandro Gonçalves do Nascimento. *Welfare and Growth Effects of Alternative Fiscal Rules for Infrastructure Investment in Brazil*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 604, EPGE–FGV, Nov 2005.
- [605] João Victor Issler, Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco, e Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén. *The Welfare Cost of Macroeconomic Uncertainty in the Post-War Period*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 605, EPGE–FGV, Dez 2005.

- [606] Marcelo Côrtes Neri, Luisa Carvalhaes, e Alessandra Pieroni. *Inclusão Digital e Redistribuição Privada*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 606, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [607] Marcelo Côrtes Neri e Rodrigo Leandro de Moura. *La institucionalidad del salario mínimo en Brasil*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 607, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [608] Marcelo Côrtes Neri e André Luiz Medrado. *Experimentando Microcrédito: Uma Análise do Impacto do CrediAMIGO sobre Acesso a Crédito*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 608, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [609] Samuel de Abreu Pessôa. *Perspectivas de Crescimento no Longo Prazo para o Brasil: Questões em Aberto*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 609, EPGE-FGV, Jan 2006.
- [610] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior e Masakazu Watanuki. *Integration Options for Mercosul – An Investigation Using the AMIDA Model*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 610, EPGE-FGV, Jan 2006.
- [611] Rubens Penha Cysne. *Income Inequality in a Job–Search Model With Heterogeneous Discount Factors (Revised Version, Forthcoming 2006, Revista Economia)*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 611, EPGE-FGV, Jan 2006.
- [612] Rubens Penha Cysne. *An Intra–Household Approach to the Welfare Costs of Inflation (Revised Version, Forthcoming 2006, Estudos Econômicos)*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 612, EPGE-FGV, Jan 2006.
- [613] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira e Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo. *On the Economic and Fiscal Effects of Infrastructure Investment in Brazil*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 613, EPGE-FGV, Mar 2006.
- [614] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo, Mario R. Páscoa, e Juan Pablo Torres-Martínez. *Bubbles, Collateral and Monetary Equilibrium*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 614, EPGE-FGV, Abr 2006.
- [615] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo e Bruno Funchal. *How much debtors’ punishment?*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 615, EPGE-FGV, Mai 2006.
- [616] Paulo Klinger Monteiro. *First–Price Auction Symmetric Equilibria with a General Distribution*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 616, EPGE-FGV, Mai 2006.
- [617] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior e Masakazu Watanuki. *Is China a Northern Partner to Mercosul?*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 617, EPGE-FGV, Jun 2006.
- [618] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior, Maria Paula Fontoura, e Rogério Guerra Santos. *Foreign direct investment spillovers in Portugal: additional lessons from a country study*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 618, EPGE-FGV, Jun 2006.